



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,980	01/26/2004	Mark Rosenbloom	91303	6603
24628	7590	01/30/2009	EXAMINER	
Husch Blackwell Sanders, LLP			WOODS, TERESA S	
Husch Blackwell Sanders LLP Welsh & Katz			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA				4114
22ND FLOOR				
CHICAGO, IL 60606				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/30/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/764,980	Applicant(s) ROSENBLUM ET AL.
	Examiner TERESA WOODS	Art Unit 4114

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/10/2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 1/26/04 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/18/2006, 4/14/2006, 3/21/2006, 3/15/2006, and 6/27/2005

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is in reply to the application filed on 1/26/2004 and the preliminary amendments filed on 3/10/2006 and 1/26/2004.
2. Claims 1-38 are currently pending and have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The Information Disclosure Statements filed 5/18/2006, 4/14/2006, 3/21/2006, 2/15/2006, and 6/27/2005 have been considered. Initiated copies of the Form 1449 are enclosed herewith.

Objections to Claims

4. The claim 17 of the disclosure is objected to, because of a typographical error. The limitation formatted below "c" should follow with the letter "d". Currently, letter "e" follows after "c". Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
6. Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ramsay (US 5,915,971 A).

7. Claim 1:

Ramsay, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *a general purpose computer* (see at least Fig.1, column 2, lines 59-60);
- *the general purpose computer configured with:*
 - a plurality of medical and drug information content pages* (see at least Fig.6, column 5, lines 1-3);
- *a reader application, the reader application configured to display medical and drug information content pages and to generate a plurality of parameter strings in response to user-selected medical and drug information* (see at least Fig.6, Fig. 7, column 3, lines 1-10) ;

This reference explains the necessity of parameters for displayable medical and drug information.

- *a drug dosing calculator application configured to receive at least one of the parameter strings generated by the reader application and to return dosing information to the reader application* (see at least Abstract, Fig.6, Fig. 7, column 5, lines 1-3).

This reference shows the necessity of parameters for displayable, medical drug dosage.

8. Claim 10:

Ramsay, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *a general purpose computer* (see at least Fig.1, column 2, lines 59-60);
- *the general purpose computer configured with:*
 - a plurality of medical and drug information content pages* (see at least Fig.6, column 5, lines 1-3);
- *a reader application, the reader application configured to display medical and drug information content pages and to generate a plurality of parameter strings in response to user-selected medical and drug information* (see at least Fig.6, Fig. 7, column 3, lines 1-10);

This reference explains the necessity of parameters for displayable medical and drug information.

- a document manager application, configured to receive the plurality of parameter strings generated by the reader application and to provide medical and drug information content pages to the reader application (see at least Fig.1 - Fig. 23, column 2, lines 10-13 and lines 23-24).

This reference shows how the parameters are used to produce medical dosage and drug information.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
11. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11-15, and 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramsay (US 5,915,971 A) in view of Borkowski (US 6,025,984 A).

12. Claims 2 and 3:

Ramsay discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Ramsay does not disclose the following limitations, but Borkowski in at least column 3, lines 8 and line 55; column 7, lines 31-32discloses:

- "*wherein the general purpose computer comprises a portable handheld computer*" (see at least).
- "*wherein the portable handheld computer comprises a Palm OS device*"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Borkowski's Palm OS device with Ramsay's computer to retrieve drug information and dosage calculator. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage and avoid any negative drug interactions in an easy and accessible way.

13. Claim 5:

Ramsay discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Ramsay does not disclose the following limitation, but Borkowski discloses "*further comprising a document manager application, configured to receive at least one of the plurality of parameter strings generated by the reader application and to provide medical and drug information content pages to the reader application*" (see at least Fig.3, column 10, lines 30-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Borkowski's displayable document and drug information manager with Ramsay's computer to retrieve drug information and dosage calculator for a more comprehensive handheld computer. This would give the medical evaluators or physicians the ability to provide better quality healthcare to their patients.

14. Claim 6:

Ramsay discloses "*wherein the document manager application further comprises a generic calculator*" (see at least Fig.19, column 7, lines 31-33) and "*provide calculator definitions to the generic calculator*" (R, Fig. 6, column 5 lines 1-3). Ramsay does not disclose the following

Art Unit: 4114

limitation, but Borkowski discloses "*wherein the document manager application is linked to a calculator definition database and calculator look up tables*" (B, column 2, lines 58-61, column 9, lines 17-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Borkowski's displayable document and drug information manager with Ramsay's generic calculator for a more comprehensive dosage calculating device. This would give the medical evaluators or physicians the ability to provide better quality healthcare to their patients.

15. Claim 8:

Ramsay discloses "*wherein the parameter string sent from the reader application to the drug dosing calculator application includes drug dosing parameters*" (see at least column 3, lines 1-8). Ramsay does not disclose the following limitation, but Borkowski discloses "*corresponding to medical and drug information included on a selected medical and drug information content page*" (see at least Fig. 3, column 10, lines 37-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Borkowski's displayable drug information with Ramsay's dosage calculating parameters for a more comprehensive medical device. This would give the medical evaluators or physicians the ability to provide better quality healthcare to their patients.

16. Claim 9:

Ramsay discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Ramsay does not disclose the following limitation, but Borkowski discloses "*wherein the parameter string sent from the reader application to the drug dosing calculator application comprises a plurality of parameter strings*" (see at least Fig. 3, column 10, lines 37-53) . It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Borkowski's parameters with Ramsay's computer to retrieve drug information and dosage calculator. This would allow medical

Art Unit: 4114

evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage and avoid any negative drug interactions in an easy and accessible way.

17. Claim 11:

Ramsay discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Ramsay does not disclose the following limitation, but Borkowski discloses "*wherein the document manager application is configured to manage an integrated medical and drug information database, including updating and controlling access to medical and drug information content pages*" (see at least column 9, lines 13-14, column 6, lines 31-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Borkowski's accessible drug information with Ramsay's computer to retrieve drug information and dosage calculator. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly access information to provide the correct drug dosage and avoid any negative drug interactions in an easy and accessible way.

18. Claim 12:

Ramsay discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Ramsay does not disclose the following limitation, but Borkowski discloses "*wherein the document manager application is configured to allow access to medical drug information content pages during the time period of a user subscription*" (see at least column 9, lines 13-14, column 6, lines 31-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Borkowski's accessible user subscription with Ramsay's computer to retrieve drug information and dosage calculator. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage and avoid any negative drug interactions in an easy and accessible way.

19. Claim 13:

Ramsay discloses "*wherein the document manager application further comprises a generic calculator*" (see at least Fig.19, column 7, lines 31-33) and "*provide calculator definitions to the generic calculator*" (see at least Fig. 6, column 5 lines 1-3). Ramsay does not disclose the following limitation, but Borkowski discloses "*wherein the document manager application is linked to a calculator definition database and calculator look up tables*" (column 2, lines 58-61, column 9, lines 17-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Borkowski's displayable document and drug information manager with Ramsay's generic calculator for a more comprehensive dosage calculating device. This would give the medical evaluators or physicians the ability to provide better quality healthcare to their patients.

20. Claim 14:

Ramsay, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *a general purpose handheld computer* (see at least Fig. 1, column 2, lines 59-60);
- *the general purpose handheld computer configured with:*
- *a plurality of medical and drug information content pages;*
- *a reader application, the reader application configured display medical and drug information content pages and to generate a plurality of parameter strings in response to user-selected medical and drug information* (see at least Fig.6, Fig. 7, column 3, lines 1-10);
- *a drug dosing calculator application configured to receive at least one of the parameter strings generated by the reader application and to return dosing information to the reader application* (see at least Abstract, Fig. 6, Fig. 7, column 5, lines 1-3);
- *a unit conversion calculator configured to receive at least one of the parameter strings generated by the reader application and to return converted units to the reader application* (see at least Fig. 10, column 6, lines 18-22).

- *wherein the document manager application further comprises a generic calculator (see at least Fig. 19, column 7, lines 31-33),*

This reference shows an optional, general purpose calculator typically provided in a word process. Ramsay discloses the limitations above. However, Ramsay does not disclose the limitation below. Borkowski discloses the following limitations:

- *a document manager application, configured to receive the plurality of parameter strings generated by the reader application and to provide medical and drug information content pages to the reader application, and wherein the document manager application is linked to a calculator definition database and calculator lookup tables to provide calculator definitions to the generic calculator (see at least column 6, lines 31-47);*

This reference serves as a definition calculator that provides extensive information about any medication. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Borkowski's displayable document and drug information calculator with Ramsay's handheld computer to perform basic calculations to assist with accurately prescribing the right amount of drugs to a patient. This would give the medical evaluators or physicians the ability to provide better quality healthcare to their patients in a timely manner

21. **Claim 15:**

Ramsay discloses "*wherein at least one of the plurality of parameter strings includes drug dosing parameters*" (see at least column 3, lines 1-8). Ramsay does not disclose the following limitation, but Borkowski discloses "*corresponding to medical and drug information included on a selected medical and drug information content page*" (see at least Fig. 3, column 10, lines 37-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Borkowski's displayable drug information with Ramsay's dosage calculating parameters for a more comprehensive medical device. This would give the medical evaluators or physicians the ability to provide better quality healthcare to their patients.

22. Claim 35:

Ramsay, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *a general purpose computer (see at least Fig.1, column 2, lines 59-60);*
- *the general purpose computer configured with:*

a reader application, the reader application configured to display the drug information content pages and to generate a plurality of parameter strings in response to user-selected drug information (see at least Fig.6, column 5, lines 1-3);

- *a reader application, the reader application configured to display medical and drug information content pages and to generate a plurality of parameter strings in response to user-selected medical and drug information (see at least Fig.6, Fig. 7, column 3, lines 1-10);*

This reference explains the necessity of parameters for displayable medical and drug information.

Ramsay discloses the limitations above. However, Ramsay does not disclose the limitation below. Borkowski discloses the following limitations:

- *a document manager application, configured to receive the plurality of parameter strings generated by the reader application and to generate application calls based upon the plurality of parameter strings; and (see at least column 2, lines 7-23)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Borkowski's document manager that generates calls with Ramsay's computer to retrieve drug information and dosage calculator. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage for prescriptions in an easy and accessible way.

Therefore, it would improve the healthcare for patients.

23. Claim 36:

Ramsay discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Ramsay does not disclose the following limitation, but Borkowski discloses *wherein at least one of the receiving applications is a medical calculator* (see at least Fig. 1, column 7, lines 40-44). It would have

Art Unit: 4114

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Borkowski's accessible user subscription with Ramsay's computer to retrieve drug information and dosage calculator. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage and avoid any negative drug interactions in an easy and accessible way. Therefore, it would improve the healthcare for patients.

24. Claim 37:

Ramsay discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Ramsay does not disclose the following limitation, but Borkowski discloses *wherein at least one of the receiving applications is a drug interaction reference application* (see at least Fig. 1, column 7, lines 40-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Borkowski's drug interaction reference with Ramsay's computer to retrieve drug information and dosage calculator. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide a comprehensive drug dosage device to avoid any negative drug interactions. Therefore, it would improve the healthcare for patients.

25. Claim 38:

Ramsay discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Ramsay does not disclose the following limitation, but Borkowski discloses *wherein at least one of the receiving applications is a drug dosing calculator* (see at least Fig. 1, column 7, lines 40-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Borkowski's dosage calculator with Ramsay's computer to retrieve drug information and dosage calculator. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage and avoid any negative drug interactions in an easy and accessible way. Therefore, it would improve the healthcare for patients.

Art Unit: 4114

26. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramsay (US 5,915,971 A) in view of Borkowski (US 6,025,984 A) in view of Official Notice.

27. **Claim 4:**

Ramsay and Borkowski disclose the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Ramsay and Borkowski do not specifically disclose "*wherein the portable handheld computer comprises a Windows OS device*". However, the Examiner takes **Official Notice** that it is old and well-known in the computer arts for health care providers to utilize Windows as a common word processor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, because this would provide a more comprehensive handheld computer. This would give the medical evaluators or physicians the ability to provide better quality healthcare to their patients.

28. Claims 7, 17, 19, 28, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramsay (US 5,915,971 A) in view of Mayaud (US 5,845,255 A).

29. **Claim 7:**

Ramsay discloses "*wherein the parameter string sent from the reader application to the drug dosing calculator application includes drug dosing parameters corresponding to*" (see at least column 3, lines 1-8). Ramsay does not disclose the following limitation, but Mayaud discloses "*a user-selected medical condition and a user-selected drug*" (see at least Fig. 20, column 4, lines 21-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mayaud's user-selected conditions and drugs with Ramsay's generic calculator for a more comprehensive dosage calculating device. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage and avoid any accidental over-dosages of healthcare patient's.

30. Claim 17:

Ramsay, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *configuring the computing device with medical and drug information content pages and a drug dosing calculator* (see at least Fig. 6, Fig. 7, column 2, lines 57-60);
- *displaying at least one medical and drug information content page on the computing device* (see at least Fig 6, column 5, lines 1-3);
- *selecting a drug from a plurality of drugs displayed on the computing device* (see at least Fig. 6, column 5, lines 1-3) ;
- *displaying a calculated drug dose* (see at least Fig. 7, Fig. 8, column 5, lines 21-22 and lines 29-31).

Ramsay does not disclose the following limitations:

- *passing drug dosing parameters corresponding to the selected medical condition and the selected drug to the drug dosing calculator* (see at least Fig. 20, column 4, lines 21-43);
- *selecting a medical condition from a plurality of medical conditions displayed on the computing device based on observations of a patient and displayed medical information* (see at least Fig. 3-5, Fig. 10, column 33, line 53 to column 34, line 15) ;

Mayaud discloses the limitation mentioned above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mayaud's drug dosages based on medical conditions with Ramsay's displayed computing device for a more comprehensive dosage calculating method. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage and avoid any accidental over-dosages of healthcare patient's. Therefore, it would improve the quality of healthcare for patients.

31. Claim 28:

Ramsay, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *a general purpose computer* (see at least Fig.1, column 2, lines 59-60);

Art Unit: 4114

- *the general purpose computer configured with:*
 - a plurality of medical and drug information content pages (see at least Fig.6, column 5, lines 1-3);*
- *a reader application, the reader application configured to display medical and drug information content pages and to generate a plurality of parameter strings in response to user-selected medical and drug information (see at least Fig.6, Fig. 7, column 3, lines 1-10);*

This reference explains the necessity of parameters for displayable medical and drug information.

- *a document manager application, configured to receive the plurality of parameter strings generated by the reader application and to provide medical and drug information content pages to the reader application (see at least Fig.1 - Fig. 23, column 2, lines 10-13 and lines 23-24).*
- *a drug dosing calculator application configured to receive at least one of the parameter strings generated by the reader application and to return dosing information to the reader application (see at least Fig. 10, column 6, lines 18-22),*

Ramsay discloses the limitations above. However, Ramsay does not disclose the limitation below. Mayaud discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein at least one of the parameter strings generated by the reader application to the drug dosing calculator application includes drug dosing parameters corresponding to a user-selected medical condition and a user-selected drug (see at least column 2, lines 57-67).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mayaud's user-selected conditions and drug information with Ramsay's handheld, drug dosage, application manager for a more comprehensive dosage calculating device. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to correlate specific drugs with a particular medical condition. Therefore, it would improve the quality of healthcare to patients.

Art Unit: 4114

32. Claim 33:

The combination of Ramsay/Mayaud discloses the limitations above. In addition, Ramsay discloses the following limitations:

- *determines if the drug dosing calculation is one of the group consisting of weight-based, body-surface-area-based, and age-based* (see at least Fig. 4, Fig. 7, column 1, lines 28-36, column 4, lines 49-55);
- *prompt the user for the appropriate patient-specific value relating to the drug dosing calculation* (Ram, see at least Fig. 4, column 4, lines 49-55).

33. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramsay (US 5,915,971 A) in view of Borkowski (US 6,025,984 A) further in view of Mayaud (US 5,845,255 A).

34. Claim 16:

The combination of Ramsay/Borkowski discloses the limitations as shown above. In addition, Ramsay discloses *wherein the parameter string sent from the reader application to the drug dosing calculator application includes drug dosing parameters corresponding to* (see at least column 2, lines 57-67). Ramsay/Borkowski do not disclose the following limitation, but Mayaud discloses *a user-selected medical condition and a user-selected drug* (see at least Fig. 20, column 14, lines 21-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mayaud's user-selected conditions and drug information with the applicable dosage calculator of Ramsay/Borkowski for a more comprehensive dosage calculating device. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to correlate specific drugs with a particular medical condition. Therefore, it would improve the quality of healthcare to patients.

Art Unit: 4114

35. Claims 18, 29, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramsay (US 5,915,971 A) in view of Mayaud (US 5,845,255 A) further in view of Borkowski (US 6,025,984 A).

36. **Claim 18:**

Ramsay and Mayaud disclose the limitations mentioned above. They do not disclose the limitations mentioned below. However, Borkowski does disclose, *"further comprising the step of selecting a method of administering the selected drug and wherein the drug dosing parameters further includes parameters corresponding to the selected method of administering the drug."* (see at least Fig. 3, column 10, lines 38-67). This reference provides a software device used to display multiple, drug information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mayaud's drug dosages based on medical conditions with Ramsay and Mayaud's displayed computing device along with means for administering a drug for a more comprehensive dosage calculating method. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage and avoid any accidental over-dosages of healthcare patient's.

37. **Claim 29:**

Ramsay discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Ramsay does not disclose the following limitation, but Borkowski discloses *wherein the document manager application is configured to manage a drug information database, including updating and controlling access to drug information content pages* (see at least column 9, lines 13-14, column 6, lines 31-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Borkowski's accessible drug information with Ramsay's computer to retrieve drug information and dosage calculator. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly access information to provide the correct drug dosage and avoid any negative drug interactions in an easy and accessible way.

Art Unit: 4114

38. Claim 30:

Ramsay/Mayaud disclose the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Ramsay/Mayaud does not disclose the following limitation, but Borkowski discloses *wherein the document manager application is configured to allow access to drug information content pages during the time period of a user subscription* (see at least column 9, lines 13-14, column 6, lines 31-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Borkowski's accessible user subscription with the computer to retrieve drug information and dosage calculator of Ramsay/Mayaud. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage and avoid any negative drug interactions in an easy and accessible way.

39. Claim 32.

Ramsay/Mayaud disclose the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Ramsay/Mayaud do not disclose the following limitation, but Borkowski discloses *wherein at least one of the parameter strings generated by the reader application to the drug dosing calculator application includes parameters corresponding to information displayed on a display of the medical reference device* (see at least Fig. 1, column 10, lines 30-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mayaud's drug dosages based on medical conditions and Ramsay's displayed computing device with Borkowski's displayable parameter for a more comprehensive dosage calculating method. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage and information to avoid any accidental over-dosages of healthcare patient's. Therefore, it would improve the quality of healthcare for patients.

Art Unit: 4114

40. Claims 19, 24, 25, 34, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayaud (US 5,845,255 A) in view of Ramsay (US 5,915,971 A).

41. **Claim 19:**

Mayaud, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *a general purpose computer* (see at least Fig. 16, column 45, lines 18-20);
- *the general purpose computer configured with: a plurality of medical and drug information content pages wherein a first page of the medical information content pages includes information to assist in a diagnosis of a medical condition and a second page of the medical information content pages includes links to a predetermined selection of drugs corresponding to a given medical diagnosis;* (see at least Fig. 5, Fig. 6, column 35, lines 1-11 and 36-43);

This reference explains the necessity of parameters for corresponding diagnosis and drug information.

- *a reader application, the reader application configured to display the medical information content pages and to generate a plurality of parameter strings in response to a selection of links by a user;* (see at least Fig. 15, column 25, lines 50-54; column 28, lines 54-58).

The first reference describes the computer link option, while the second reference shows a sample document of medical drug dosage as a displayable parameter.

- *a document manager application, configured to receive at least one of the plurality of parameter strings generated by the reader application and to provide medical information content pages to the reader application; and* (see at least Fig. 14, Fig. 15, column 25, lines 50-54);

This reference shows a sample document of medical drug dosage as a displayable parameter.

- *wherein at least one of the parameter strings generated by the reader application to the drug dosing calculator application includes drug dosing parameters corresponding to a user-*

selected medical condition and a user-selected drug (see at least Fig. 9, Fig. 10, column 38, lines 27-30).

Mayaud disclose the limitations above. However, Mayaud does not disclose the limitation below. Ramsay discloses the following limitations:

- a drug dosing calculator application configured to receive at least one of the parameter strings generated by the reader application and to return dosing information to the reader application (see at least Fig. 6-23, column 2, lines 57 to column 3, line 8),

Ramsay describes drug dosage as a one of the parameter strings in the application. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mayaud's document-base user application with Ramsay's dosage calculator for a more comprehensive medical reference device. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage and avoid any accidental over-dosages of healthcare patient's. Therefore, it would improve the quality of healthcare for patients.

42. **Claim 24:**

Mayaud/Ramsay disclose the limitations as shown in the rejections above. In addition, Ramsay discloses *wherein the document manager application is configured to received all of the plurality of parameter strings from the reader application, and further configured to send only those strings concerning drug dosing calculations to the drug dosing calculator* (see at least Fig. 6, Fig. 7, Fig. 10, column 5, lines 21-22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mayaud's document-base user application with Ramsay's drug dosage calculator that receives multiple parameter strings for a more comprehensive medical reference device. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to use a more comprehensive reference device to provide a patient's drug dosage. Therefore, it would improve the quality of healthcare for patients.

43. Claim 25:

Mayaud/Ramsay disclose the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Mayaud does not disclose the following limitations, but Ramsay discloses *wherein the document manager application and the drug dosing calculator are separate programs* (Ram, see at least Fig. 3, column 4, lines 10-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mayaud's document-base user application with Ramsay's ability to calculate the drug dosage with a separate program for a more comprehensive medical reference device. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to use a more comprehensive reference device to provide a patient's drug dosage. Therefore, it would improve the quality of healthcare for patients.

44. Claim 34:

Mayaud, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- *a general purpose computer* (see at least Fig. 16, column 45, lines 18-20);
- *the general purpose computer configured with: a plurality of medical and drug information content pages wherein a first page of the medical information content pages includes information to assist in a diagnosis of a medical condition and a second page of the medical information content pages includes links to a predetermined selection of drugs corresponding to a given medical diagnosis;* (see at least Fig. 5, Fig.6, column 35, lines 1-11 and 36-43);

This reference explains the necessity of parameters for corresponding diagnosis and drug information.

- *a reader application, the reader application configured to display the medical information content pages and to generate a plurality of parameter strings in response to a selection of links by a user;* (see at least Fig. 15, column 25, lines 50-54; column 28, lines 54-58).

The first reference describes the computer link option, while the second reference shows a sample document of medical drug dosage as a displayable parameter.

Art Unit: 4114

- a document manager application, configured to receive at least one of the plurality of parameter strings generated by the reader application and to provide medical information content pages to the reader application; and (see at least Fig. 14, Fig. 15, column 25, lines 50-54);

This reference shows a sample document of medical drug dosage as a displayable parameter.

- wherein at least one of the parameter strings generated by the reader application to the drug dosing calculator application includes drug dosing parameters corresponding to a user-selected medical condition and a user-selected drug (see at least Fig. 9, Fig. 10, column 38, lines 27-30).

Mayaud disclose the limitations above. However, Mayaud does not disclose the limitation below. Ramsay discloses the following limitations:

- a drug dosing calculator application configured to receive at least one of the parameter strings generated by the reader application and to return dosing information to the reader application (see at least Fig. 6-23, column 2, lines 57 to column 3, line 8),

Ramsay describes drug dosage as a one of the parameter strings in the application. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mayaud's document-base user application with Ramsay's dosage calculator for a more comprehensive medical reference device. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage and avoid any accidental over-dosages of healthcare patient's. Therefore, it would improve the quality of healthcare for patients.

Art Unit: 4114

45. Claims 20, 22, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayaud (US 5,845,255 A) in view of Ramsay (US 5,915,971 A) further in view of Campbell (US 6,047,259 A).

46. **Claim 20.**

Mayaud and Ramsay disclose the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Mayaud and Ramsay do not disclose the following limitation, but Campbell discloses *wherein the document manager application is configured to manage a medical information database, including updating and controlling access to medical information content pages* (see at least column 2, lines 18-21, column 3, lines 55-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mayaud's drug dosages based on medical conditions and Ramsay's displayed computing device with Campbell's document manager database for a more comprehensive dosage calculating method. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage and avoid any accidental over-dosages of healthcare patient's. Therefore, it would improve the quality of healthcare for patients.

47. **Claim 22.**

Mayaud and Ramsay disclose the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Mayaud and Ramsay do not disclose the following limitation, but Campbell discloses *wherein the document manager application and the reader application are separate programs* (see at least Fig. 11-14, Fig. 9-10, column). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mayaud's drug dosages based on medical conditions and Ramsay's displayed computing device with Campbell's separate document manager for a more comprehensive dosage calculating method. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage and avoid any accidental over-dosages of healthcare patient's. Therefore, it would improve the quality of healthcare for patients.

48. Claim 26.

Mayaud and Ramsay disclose the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Mayaud and Ramsay do not disclose the following limitation, but Campbell discloses *wherein the document manager application is launched by selecting a link* (see at least column 15, lines 29-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mayaud's drug dosages based on medical conditions and Ramsay's displayed computing device with Campbell's screens being launched with links for a more comprehensive reference device. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage in an easy and quick way. Therefore, it would improve the quality of healthcare provided to patients.

49. Claims 21, 23, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayaud (US 5,845,255 A) in view of Ramsay (US 5,915,971 A) further in view of Official Notice.

50. Claim 21.

Mayaud and Ramsay disclose the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Mayaud and Ramsay do not disclose *wherein the document manager application is configured to allow access to medical information content pages during the time period of a user subscription*. However, the examiner takes **Official Notice** that it is old and well-known in the computing arts to access content pages of an application during a user's subscription such as, logging into a program because this allows the users to keep information accessible only to its designated staff members. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mayaud and Ramsay because this protects sensitive documents from being viewed by unauthorized persons.

51. **Claim 23.**

Mayaud and Ramsay disclose the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Mayaud and Ramsay do not disclose *wherein the document manager application and the reader application are separate programs, and the reader application is closed when the document manager application is opened*. However, the examiner takes **Official Notice** that it is old and well-known in the computing arts to have separate applications such as, for example, viewing and management applications for documents. In addition, it is old and well-known in the computing arts to close a viewing application before launching a filer management application because this allows the user to move, copy, etc, without the file being open. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mayaud and Ramsay because this provides a more user-friendly environment.

52. **Claim 27.**

Mayaud and Ramsay disclose the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Mayaud and Ramsay do not disclose *wherein the document manager application is launched by selecting an icon*. However, the examiner takes **Official Notice** that it is old and well-known in the computing arts to use desktop icons to launch most software application managers because this allows the users to access the program quickly and easily. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mayaud and Ramsay because this provides a more user-friendly environment.

Art Unit: 4114

53. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramsay (US 5,915,971 A) in view of Mayaud (US 5,845,255 A) further in view of Campbell (US 6,047,259 A).

54. **Claim 31.**

Ramsay/Mayaud disclose the limitations as shown in the rejections above. Ramsay/Mayaud do not disclose the following limitation, but Campbell discloses *wherein the document manager application and the drug dosing calculator are separate programs* (see at least Fig. 11-14, Fig. 9-10, column). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mayaud's drug dosages based on medical conditions and Ramsay's displayed computing device with Campbell's separate document manager for a more comprehensive dosage calculating method. This would allow medical evaluators or physicians the ability to quickly provide the correct drug dosage and avoid any accidental over-dosages of healthcare patient's. Therefore, it would improve the quality of healthcare for patients.

Conclusion

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **Teresa Woods** whose telephone number is **571.270.5509**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **JAMES A. REAGAN** can be reached at **571.272.6710**. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free).

Art Unit: 4114

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to 571-273-8300.

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the **United States Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window:**

Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314.

/TERESA WOODS/
Examiner, Art Unit 4114
1/14/09

/James A. Reagan/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4114